

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 2, 8, 14, 21-32, 34-35 and 37-38 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-20, 33, 36 and 39-41 remain in this application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiner Rahmjoo for the telephone interview conducted on June 7, 2006 with the undersigned. The arguments provided during the telephone interview are also discussed in the present Response. MPEP § 713.04.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-20, 33, 36, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naoi (U.S. Patent No. 6,683,617) in view of Marugame (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,649). For the reasons discussed during the telephone interview and further set out below, Naoi neither discloses nor suggests overwriting (or a means for overwriting) in the manner set out in the claims. (The Examiner does not assert that Marugame teaches such features).

Claim 1, e.g., defines an image rendering apparatus that includes:

image rendering means for rendering the three-dimensional image to generate respective pluralities of first values for each pixel in the three-dimensional image whereby a given one of the pluralities of first values is associated with a specific one of the pixels in the three-dimensional image, the rendered image including a portion in which aliasing occurs;

antialiasing means for antialiasing only the extracted data to form an antialiased image portion associated with the visually important line part by generating respective pluralities of second values for each pixel in the visually important line part whereby a given one of the pluralities of second values is

associated with a specific one of the pixels in the visually important line part; and

overwriting means for overwriting by using the pluralities of second values associated with each pixel of the visually important line part to replace the pluralities of first values associated with each pixel of the visually important line part thereby at least reducing the aliasing of the portion of the rendered image. (Emphasis added).

As noted during the telephone interview, an example of rendering a three-dimensional image to generate respective pluralities of first values for each pixel in a three-dimensional image is described in ¶¶ [0077]-[0085] of the specification, an example of antialiasing only extracted data to form an antialiased image portion associated with a visually important line part by generating pluralities of second values generated for each pixel in the visually important line part is described in ¶¶ [0087]-[0093] of the specification, and an example of an overwriting by using pluralities of second values associated with each pixel of a visually important line to replace pluralities of first values associated with each pixel of the visually important line part is described in ¶¶ [0094]-[0095] of the specification.

The Examiner contends that Naoi teaches an overwriting means and refers to the integration/selection circuit at block 105 of Fig. 7. The integration/selection circuit 105, however, is part of the blending circuit 10 that performs antialiasing. (See col.8 11.1-12, and col.11 11.28-31.) The blending circuit 10 carries out antialiasing using a repetitive process in which the integration/selection circuit 105 (i) receives the stored sub-pixel masks and associated color data generated during the most recent iteration, (ii) receives the sub-pixel masks and associated color data blended during the current iteration, (iii) combines any of the received sub-pixel masks that are associated with the same color data, (iv) counts

the number of valid sub-pixels in each received or combined sub-pixel mask and selects the four sub-pixel masks having the highest number of valid sub-pixels, and (v) outputs the selected sub-pixel masks to mask and color buffers for storage and use in the next iteration. (See Figs.7, 9 and 11; Fig.10 steps S2 and S3; and col.9 1.15 to col.10 1.67.) After the last iteration is carried out, *weighting average circuit 106* subjects the resulting stored sub-pixel masks and associated color data to weighting and then uses the weighted values to blend the color data and determine the final color of that pixel. (See Fig.7, Fig.10 steps S4-s7, col.8 1.66 to col.9 1.6, and col.11 11.1-22.)

Thus, the integration/selection circuit merely receives *data generated during the previous iteration* within the antialiasing process and then outputs *data that is to be used during the next iteration* within the antialiasing process or, during the last iteration, outputs *data that is to be used by the weighting average circuit*. The integration/selection circuit does not handle any of the data associated with the *final antialiased image*, i.e., the integration/selection circuit does not use the pluralities of second values. Therefore, Naoi's description of the integration/selection circuit does not disclose or suggest the overwriting means defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Independent claims 7, 13, 19, 20, 33 and 36 each include limitations similar to those set out in claim 1, and each is therefore distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1, claims 9-12 depend from claim 7, claims 15-18 depend from claim 13, claim 39 depends from claim 20, claim 40 depends from claim 33, and claim 41 depends from claim 36. Therefore, each of claims 9-12,

15-18, and 39-41 is distinguishable over the cited art at least for the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BY 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant